



Wisconsin Conservation Congress  
Bear Committee  
Meeting Minutes

**WCC Meeting Minutes**  
Form 8300-026 (R 11/17) Page 1 of 4

<b>ORDER OF BUSINESS</b>	12/08/2018	9:00 AM	Mead Education Center
--------------------------	------------	---------	-----------------------

**I. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting called to order by	Mike Rogers at 9:05 AM
----------------------------	------------------------

**B. ROLL CALL**

ATTENDEES	Bruce Prentice, Mike Murphy, Jeff Thums, Connie Kadubek-Polzin, Scott Plocar, Hunter Denison, Rick Desotell, Dennis Jones, Scott Strook, Jeff Klatt, Arlen Heistad, Perry Hurlburt, Ralph Fritsch, Bob Knorr, Al Urness, Kelly Crotty, Eugene Tom Muench, Gary Mabie, Joe Stuchlak, Dave Mabie, Nathan Roberts, Scott Walter, Mike Rogers, Al Lobner, Chuckler Dreher
EXCUSED	Jim Thompson, Robert Kaminskis
UNEXCUSED	Chandra Stafford, Kieran Kramer, Christopher Wegner, Cody Gadow
GUESTS	Matt Lallemon, Laurie Groskoph, Mike Brust, Arlyn Splitt, Glen Stauffer, Tim Ebert, Kip Muench, Colleen J. Locke-Murphy, Mike Hurlburt, Ben Herbert, Kevin Cain, Diane Cain, Dave Polzin, Larry Bonde, Phil Klaar, Jennifer Garde, Jeremy Parish

**C. AGENDA APPROVAL/REPAIR**

DISCUSSION	None
ACTION	Motion to accept agenda as written, approved.

**D. REVIEW COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT**

DISCUSSION	The current Mission Statement was read by Chair Mike Rogers.
ACTION	Motion was made by Mike Murphy to leave Mission Statement as is second by Connie Kadubek-Polzin, motion carried.

**E. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

DISCUSSION	Jeremy Parish spoke on behalf of the Wolf Patrol regarding the Resolution to limit bear baiting. Laurie Groskoph also spoke on the impact of wolves on the landscape and the effect on hunting, hunters and hunting hounds and how these factors should be included in the wildlife management plans. Mike Brust came to speak regarding the draft of the Bear Management Plan with regard to the potential hound hunting zone expansion.
ACTION	Mike Rogers thanks all those who gave comments.

**II. INFORMATION & ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Bear Preference Point Changes Res. 560418**

Read by Mike Rogers

DISCUSSION	Dave Mabie felt it was not justifiable for those that are fortunate to own land to be able to purchase extra preference. Other committee members commented that many farmers would just like more hunters to approach them and get permission to hunt their land and make it fair for everyone.	
ACTION	Motion to reject and seconded, motion carried.	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

**B. Limit bear baiting to 3 sites Res. 040918**

Read by Mike Rogers

DISCUSSION	Some members felt that parts of the resolution had merit but there were too many things included that needed to be clarified before they could support such a resolution and felt it would be hard to get enough public support to get it passed. It would also be an enforcement problem at this point for law enforcement with regard to guides with many clients. Kelly Crotty felt most people did not start baiting as early as was allowed as it is costly and as far as registering a bait it would be a considerable amount of work for law enforcement to monitor if hunters had to change their bait locations due to ineffectiveness, visitations by only sows with cubs, or other situations. Questions were brought up if guides would be allowed to bait a certain number of baits for multiple clients and what would that
------------	---

	number be. Many of these questions were brought up by the DNR Bear Committee during their Management Plan discussions and some at great length.
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to reject by Mike Murphy, second by Dennis Jones. Motion carried.
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

**C. Quarter Deer, Bear, & Elk Res. 440518**

Timothy Ebert

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Tim described how he felt the resolution would work and what its advantages were. Tim has worked with DNR Law Enforcement to ensure that all requirements are met with regard to legal size. There was concern with the inclusion of the deer and elk on the resolution with regard to CWD. However the resolution is written similar to how the emergency rule was written for the past deer hunting season with regard to handling deer carcasses. This resolution is just another option for those that may have a difficult time retrieving their game. A question was brought up regarding if a deer is found out to have CWD at a later date should coordinates be taken and what about the prions. If there is CWD there are prions being spread prior to that time.</p> <p>Another question is what will be the departments position next year and will this resolution be in line with that position. At this point there are a lot of unanswered questions and this committee is just trying to do what they feel is the best solution with what information we have at this time. Another situation is should deer and elk be included since this is the bear committee. It was the committee feeling that the public should discuss it and then they can sort it out.</p>	
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to advance by Mike Murphy second by Rick Desotell, motion carried with Bruce Prentice voting against.	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	

**D. Restore Bear App to Patrons License Res. 660618**

Read by Mike Rogers

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Members liked the convenience of having all the costs of licensing included in one cost and would like it to return that way.	
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to reject by Mike Murphy motion died due to no second. Motion to advance by Ralph Fritsch second by Rick Desotell, motion carried with Mike Murphy against.	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	

**E. Non-resident hunting laws Res. 370118**

Ben Hebert

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Ben felt there were no advantages to being a resident to Wisconsin and feels that non-residents to Wisconsin should be treated the same as we are treated when we go to other states if we should decide to go elsewhere. He feels that if we have restrictions when we go to other states those non-residents should have those same restrictions when they come here. Members of the committee were concerned about the effect that this would have on the northwoods economy by limiting the number of non-residents to Wisconsin. This discussion comes up almost yearly and the perception is there are more non-residents than what there really are. The author was asked if he would withdraw the first item of his resolution so the committee would feel better about forwarding this resolution.</p> <p>Committee members didn't want to restrict their non-resident family members from participating in Wisconsin because of the 2% portion of this resolution. This has always been an issue of contention within this committee and appears to yet at this time. Ben agreed to remove this portion of his resolution if that would move this resolution forward.</p> <p>There was concern with the resolution that if that was removed could other states restrict us but that would be covered by the part of the reciprocity agreement portion of the resolution. There was a question raised as to what it would cost to implement this on the licensing system. Scott Walter had talked to Linda Olver about this implementation and her thoughts were it would be very challenging. There were other questions and concerns but the committee felt it might be best to move it forward and let the public's voice be heard.</p>	
<b>ACTION</b>	Motion to reject by Mike Murphy second by Al Lobner. There was an amendment to remove the first item in the resolution marked number "1" regarding the 2% limit of non-residents which carried. Motion was made to forward motion as amended by Mike Murphy and seconded by Bruce Prentice. Motion carried Bruce Prentice abstained.	
<b>PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>	

## F. Department Info &amp; Updates

Scott Walter, Nathan Roberts, Kelly Crotty

DISCUSSION	<p>DNR info began with Nathan Roberts going over his research regarding efforts and results of population models, research, and future research projects. There was a discovery that the population model was not working as good as he had hoped. In the past we were led to believe that we knew the exact number of bears on the landscape but the fact is we don't even know how many people inhabit the earth how would we know how many bears we have. Our models are better served to show us trends which is a better way to manage the bear population. There was an oversight in that the age of harvest for 2017 was not sent out to those that harvested bears but will be going out shortly. The aging of bears is still being done in Montana.</p> <p>There is a move to improve the mark recapture study from the old tetracycline study to a hair snare DNA study which will be allowed by the federal government since we no longer can use tetracycline on the landscape. Barbed wire is used to get the hair and a peanut butter slurry is used for bait to bring the bears in. There was a pilot study done this year in Oneida and the northern tier of Lincoln county. The pilot study worked very well, there were 50 baits set out and there were over 100 bears identified. The identification of the DNA was done at East Stroudsburg University. This year hunters in Zone B were asked to send in 2 teeth with their harvest samples to be used for this pilot. It is still the plan to do this mark/recapture study every 5 years as we did with the tetracycline study. The first statewide hair snare study should be the spring of 2019 and the results will be sooner than done with the tooth marker. All counties with more than 5 bears harvested will be included in this new study.</p> <p>The mortality rate of sows and cubs to wolves was also a source of concern with members of the committee. This is being talked about and addressed in the new Bear Management Plan. It is felt that many of these concerns can be answered by collaring bears and studying what really is going on out on the landscape. Baiting and its effects are also being addressed in the new plan as well.</p> <p>At this time Scott Walter spoke on 2018 harvest summary he handed out to us as the meeting began. Zones A and D came close to meeting the harvest goal however Zones B and C did not do quite as well. Scott explained how the harvest success was determined and what it means and how it can work in the future. There was a very interesting chart regarding bear harvest history dating back to 1957 which was before there was actually a fall bear hunting season.</p> <p>A review of the recommended 2019 harvest goals was discussed at this time. There were some changes recommended for zones A and C to decrease the harvest for 2019. There are also some places in zone C where people seem to be more accepting of bears and bears seem to want to live and therefore it is felt that the harvest should be reduced to grow that population. The consensus statewide was that the bears were smaller and not as abundant as they have been in the past.</p> <p>Damage and nuisance permits were up this year, however the number of bears harvested with damage permits was down from last year. Scott and Brad Koele continue to work together to try and work with farmers to reduce damage and mitigate the costs. There does not seem to be any major changes from last year so the feeling is that the bear populations are stabilizing and problems weren't getting any worse.</p> <p>Scott also spoke on the process of developing a new Bear Management Plan and where it is at this point and what the time table is expected to be if there are no major developments. He also reviewed what some of the possible changes may be should this plan be accepted by the NRB and the Wisconsin public. Increasing bear populations in the central forest and the Southwest driftless area. A possible hound hunting season in the central forest area may also be considered. A numerical goal may be eliminated to allow for more flexibility in these areas with emerging bear populations. This also appears to be the same approach that is being used by the CDAC committee's.</p> <p>Kelly Crotty spoke at this time on the Learn to Hunt program. There were also some complaints in Florence, Forest, and Vilas counties where baits were too close to the roads. Some people that are trying to drive closer to their baits are in effect creating a violation for themselves because they are creating a trail. Warden staffing is ongoing and transfers and hiring will be continuing to fill positions. Deer baiting continues to be an issue.</p>	
ACTION	<p>A motion was made to support a harvest quota recommendation of 900 for Zone A by Ralph Fritsch and seconded by Gary Mabie. Motion carried. A motion was made and seconded to support the harvest quota recommendation of 785 for Zone B. Motion carried. A motion was made and seconded to support a Zone C harvest quota recommendation of 850. Motion carried. A motion was made by Ralph Fritsch and seconded by Mike Murphy to support a Zone D harvest quota recommendation of 1300. Motion carried.</p>	
PERSON(S) RESPONSIBLE		DEADLINE

## III. MEMBERS MATTERS

DISCUSSION	<p>Connie mentioned that a lot of young people have so many things going on they can only devote one weekend to hunt bears. There was another discussion regarding baiting and its effect on bear litters and litter sizes. Although this is not proven and is just anecdotal many hunters feel it is having an effect. With the proposed changes there is also some</p>
------------	--

	concern regarding wait times for permits next year. Zones A and C will be effected most by this change. There should be public meetings when the Bear Management Plan is ready to roll out to the public, and it is thought that the WCC Bear Committee will be meeting but there is no scheduled meeting at this time because the time frame is still very fluid and subject to many variables. How many public meetings there will be still has not been decided either. Members of the WCC Bear Committee felt they should be able to see the plan before it was presented to the public.
<b>ACTION</b>	

**IV. ADJOURNMENT**

<b>MEETING ADJOURNED</b>	<b>12:25 PM</b>
<b>SUBMITTED BY</b>	<b>Al Lobner</b>
<b>DATE</b>	<b>12/08/2018</b>